46

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN SOUTHERN DIVISION

Davis-Bey Bobby DeAndre- Bey, Mufti/Consul
Indigenous Moorish-American National
And Citizen for the Free National-Republic
"With Reservation of ALL RIGHTS this Indigenous
Moorish-American is Not to be compelled to Accept

Any Unrevealed benefits, contracts or commercial

Agreements, nor subject to any unrevealed presumptions

And Uniform Commercial Code 1-207, 1-308, 103.6

Or Silent Judicial Notices." See 28 USC sec. 1746

Secured Party/Plaintiff

Defendants

Case:2:14-cv-12167 Judge: Cleland, Robert H. MJ: Hluchaniuk, Michael J. Filed: 06-02-2014 At 12:55 PM CMP DAVIS-BEY v. STATE OF MI, ET AL

CASE NO: # 13-30091

Lo C WARRANT NO: #13-5-01352

VS

STATE OF MICHIGAN (Municipal Administrative Corporate

Lib Distriction

State/Republic of Michigan), CITY OF SOUTHFIELD (Municipal Administrative

Corporate state/Republic of Michigan), SOTAYLORM (TAYLOR, MATTHEW)

(Municipal Administrative Corporate state/Republic of Michigan employee),

SOMATATALLB (MATATALL, BLAKE) (Municipal Administrative Corporate

state/Republic of Michigan employee), SCOTT KRAMER (Municipal

Administrative Corporate state/Republic of Michigan employee),

JASON SCHNEIDER, RYAN LOSH,

AFFIDAVIT/LEGAL NOTICE OF REMOVAL & CONSTER CLAIM MEMORANDUM OF LAW

AFFIDAVIT OF TRUTH

DECLARATION OF MOORISH INDIGENOUS RIGHTS

Ultimate Claim of Legal Freedom

l Bobby DeAndre Davis-Bey, a Pre-Columbian Indigenous Moorish-American, do declare I have redeemed myself from being Public to being a Private Moorish Free Sole. Who has willfully lawfully and legally made the Ultimate Claim to legal freedom by being a Registered and active consul within the Institution of the Moorish National and Divine Movement of Northwest, South America's etc., and all of its adjacent islands. Having a valid registration #0015 on file with an Authorized Moorish National Divine Movement. (See our Authority Exhibit #1)

Here now, and Hereafter I, Bobby DeAndre Davis-Bey hereby depose and declares:

I am a **living, breathing,** and flesh and blood man having liability under the laws of nature. I am over the age of consent. This affidavit is based on my firsthand knowledge & belief, whereupon I deny the existence of the following Corporations:

BOBBY DAVIS, BOBBY DIANDRA DAVIS, BOBBY DEANDRE DAVIS, BOBBY D. DAVIS OF 15742 LAUDER, DETROIT MICHIGAN, 48227, STATE OF MICHIGAN, COUNTY OF WAYNE, CITY OF DETROIT, 36 DISTRICT COURT, FRANK MURPHY HALL OF JUSTICE, UNITED STATES and all of its subsidiaries, and all BAR ASSOCIATIONS JUDGES AND LAWYERS.

HERENOW, AND HEREAFTER, being the secured Indigenous Moorish-American, Private party by activating the common law remedy in law. I have regained my INDIGENOUS RIGHTS secured by:

- 1.) RIGHTS OF INDIGENOUS PEOPLE- UNITED NATIONS: General assembly, part 1 article 4, part I article 1, 2,3,4,5, part II article 6.
- 2.) UNIVERSAL DECLARATION OF HUMAN RIGHTS [Article (15)].
- 3.) RESOLUTION NUMBER SEVENTY-FIVE (75) Dated April 17, 1933 A.D. (Moorish-American Society of Philadelphia and the use of their Names).
- 4.) UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION: Article III(3), section 2, Amendment V (5) (Liberty Clause) & Amendment 9 Reservation of the rights of the people.

- 5.) UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT: SUPREME LAW- ACTS OF STATES.
- 6.) The foreign Sovereigns Immunity Act 28 USC 1601.
- 7.) "Executive Order 13107- UNITED REPUBLIC OF NORTH AMERICA: THE IMPLEMENTATION OF HUMAN RIGHTS.
- 8.) TREATY OF PEACE & FRIENDSHIP OF 1787.
- 9.) HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 192

HERENOW, AND HEREAFTER, have a private account #385848705 with the United States Treasury department. I execute my Private Aboriginal Indigenous rights. Having the Legal and Lawful rights of a Free Sole with the Powers to charge back/ accept for value and employ the Non-Negotiable Act.

Wherefore, all parties of interest in the above are authorized by this affidavit, pursuant to National and International law, to honor [All] substantive Rights and Constitutional Immunities reserved for, and to, this Aboriginal-Indigenous Free Moorish American (Moor).

All Officials are to enlist all available and appropriate measures to ensure, and assure that all my substantive rights and Constitutionally – Secured rights and Immunities are not violated, not breached nor abridged. This Moorish natural being named herein is not to be arrested nor held for detention under any "Colorable circumstances"! You are to notify the active Divine Ministers of the Aboriginal/Indigenous Moorish National Territory (Organic Land). The Natural Person named herein is NON-OBGLITORY and thus is Exempt from customs, Tariffs, taxation, Owner in fee permit-deception constructs, and from any other hindrance or restriction of his freedoms, Allodial properties, compensations, Rights to Travel, or Freedoms of Movement on, in or within, any member or non-member states of the United States Union, etc., This Moor/Muur (bearer of this Indigenous Peoples' Document) is to be treated with all due respect and 'Due Process rights' under the laws of the land. All available and appropriate measures are to be taken to prevent injustice, harm false arrest, trumped up charges, or attacks on the Natural Being's person property, personality, Conveyances, Freedoms, and or Dignity.

EXPLICIT RESERVATION and use of 'All Rights Reserved WITHOUT PREJUDICE U.C.C 1-207/308, U.C.C. 1-03 IS Noted to [ALL] Federal, State, City and Municipal Peace Officers: in Harmony with State Statutes and indicates the resurrection on My RIGHTS. Whereby I may reserve my Substantive Rights and Constitutional Rights and immunities to NOT be compelled to perform under any contracts or Agreements that I have not entered into knowingly, voluntarily, willingly, or unintentionally.

I do not accept, any actual or implied 'Liabilities' associated with any "COMPELLED-BENEFITS" of any 'unrevealed' or deceptively imposed commercial contracts. I furthermore, do not sanction any Unconstitutional Rules or Policies, nor Acts of Misprision committed by any U.S. Government or STATE Officials, at any level, Claimed by any of them, in the name of the United States Republic, Nor do I asset to any implied colorable Policies made

by alleged to be related to me as being mis-representives, as being sanctioned by the People and Citizens. Consider any formally assumed constructs alleged to be related to me as being misrepresentations and thusly 'Cured' Forthwith let it be known...

I, Bobby DeAndre Davis-Bey a real live flesh and blood, breathing, nonfictional, and Natural Being born of a Natural Mother, do Solemnly, Sincerely, and squarely affirm that the foregoing facts contained in this Affidavit of Truth and Proclamation is True to the Best of My Knowledge, Culture, Customs, Faiths and Beliefs; being Actual correct, not misleading etc., and being the Truth, the whole Truth, and nothing but the Truth.

Any man or woman intending to rebut this affidavit, shall do so in the manner of this affidavit, using your **Christian** name or **Baptismal** name or name given at birth for signature in upper case and lower case format, not all **Capital letters**, hence representing a fully liable, living, breathing, Flesh and Blood man, responsible/liable for everything you say and do. You will mail your affidavits to the below address within **twenty-four hours (24)** of receipt of this affidavit.

All Rights Reserved without Prejudice,

U.C.C. 1-207, 308, U.C.C. 1-103.8

I am: Bobby DeAndre Davis-Bey, Authorized Representative

Red Right Thumb Finger Print

Witness 1 by: Brother A. Barnes-By, Sheck

Red Moorish signature

Bobby DeAndre Davis-Bey Natural Person-

In Propria Person- All Rights Reserved

Authorized Representative

By X Sully Down Du By

Ex Relatione: Bobby D. Davis (not a Corporate Person or Entity, Misrepresented

By Fraudulent Construct of (ALL CAPITAL

LETTERS) All Rights Reserved: U.C.C. 1-207

/1-308/1-103

Michigan Territory

[C/O 17381 Stout

Detroit, Michigan [Zip Exempt]

Non Domestic

Witness 2 by: Risher D. Dany Buy

ap Exempty

SAESHA MONET NIX
NOTARY PUBLIC - STATE OF MICHIGAN
COUNTY OF WAYNE
My Commission Expires May 17, 2020
Acting in the County of

Moorish Seal:

Notary Public:

AFFIDAVIT TO DISMISS FORLACK OF JURISDICTION AND FAILURE TO STATE A CLAIM UPON WHICH RELIEF CAN BE GRANTED

NOW COME, Bobby DeAndre Davis-Bey and moves this court to **dismiss** an action that was proceeded against his private person that took place on or about **May 10, 2014.** Defendant request is pursuant to **Michigan Court Rules** as follows:

Rule 2.003 (A) (B) (C) Disqualification of Judge

(C) Grounds.

- (1) **Disqualification of a judge** is warranted for reasons that include, but are not Limited to, the following:
- (d) The judge has been consulted or employed as an attorney in the matter in controversy.

- (f) The judge knows that he or she, individually or as a fiduciary, or the judge's spouse, parent or child wherever residing, or any other member of the judge's family residing in the judge's household, has more than a **de minimis** economic interest in the subject matter in controversy that could be substantially impacted by the proceeding.
- (g) (ii) is acting as a lawyer in the proceeding;

Rule 2.110 Pleadings

- (3) A counterclaim,
- (4) A third-party complaint,

Rule 2.116 Summary Disposition

- (B) Motion.
- (1) A party may move for dismissal of or judgment on all or part of a claim in Accordance with this rule. A party against whom a defense is asserted may Move under this rule for summary disposition of the defense. A request for Dismissal without prejudice under MCL 600.2912c must be made by motion Under MCR 2.116 and MCR 2.119.
 - (2) A motion under this rule may be filed at any time consistent with sub rule
 - (D) And sub rule (G)(1), but the hearing on a motion brought by a party

Asserting a claim shall not take place until at least 28 days after the opposing Party was served with the pleading stating the claim.

- (C) Grounds.
- (1) The court lacks jurisdiction over the person or property.
- (8) The opposing party has failed to state a claim on which relief can be

Granted.

Rule 2.221 Motion for Change of Venue

Rule 2.223 Change of Venue; Venue Improper

- (A) Motion; Court's Own Initiative. If the venue of a civil action is improper, the Court
- (1) Shall order a change of venue on timely motion of a defendant, or
- (2) May order a change of venue on its own initiative with notice to the parties

 And opportunity for them to be heard on the venue question.

If venue is changed because the action was brought where venue was not proper, the action may be transferred only to a county in which venue would have been proper.

<u>AFFIDAVIT</u>

Affiant, a Moorish American National Aboriginal Indigenous Divine Being-Manifested in human flesh to Declare by virtue of Divine Law: under the laws of the united: states of America, anno: Domini 1791, and the United States Republic Constitution; and upon the Honor of our Fore-Mothers and Fore-Fathers that the above Affidavits, Motion and Counter Claims, and all Jurisdiction claims is true and correct to the best of my knowledge and honorable intent.

Respectfully submitted this <u>19</u> day of _	<i>MA</i> ^Q , 1434 M.C.= (C.C.Y. 2014)
Thank You,	

I Am: Bolly Du Du By

Bobby DeAndre Davis-Bey

Authorized Representative

Natural Person, In Propria Persona:

Ex Relatione: Bobby D. Davis (not a

Corporate Person or Entity, Misrepresented

By Fraudulent Construct of (ALL CAPITAL

LETTERS) All Rights Reserved: U.C.C. 1-207

/1-308/1-103

Witness: R

Michigan Territory

[C/O 17381 Stout

Detroit, Michigan [Zip Exempt] Non Domestic

Witness: <u>Fristher A. Darmes-Gey</u>, S

Natural Person-In Propria Person-All Rights Reserved

Natural Person-In Propria Person All Rights Reserved

Moorish Seal:

Notary Public:

SAESHA MONET NIX **NOTARY PUBLIC - STATE OF MICHIGAN COUNTY OF WAYNE**

My Commission Expires May 17, 2020

Acting in the County of <u>Wa</u>



Cc: United States Justice Dept.

United States Attorney General Eric H. Holder, Jr.

State of Michigan Governor Richard Dale "Rick" Snyder

State of Michigan Attorney General **Bill Schuette**

State of Michigan Secretary of State **Ruth Johnson**

United Nations High Commission Palais Wilson

International Justice Court The Hague, the Netherlands

International Criminal Courts Lusi Moreno-Ocampo the Hague, the Netherlands.

United States Department of State Hillary Rodham Clinton

FROM MUNICIPAL COURT TO FEDERAL COURT PURSUANT TO TITLE 28 USC SEC. 1441-1446 PROPER ARTICLE III JURISDICTION

Official Notice is hereby served on the 46th JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT IN STATE OF MICHIGAN, in the COUNTY of WAYNE (Municipal Administrative Corporate State/Republic of Michigan), CITY OF SOUTHFIELD 46th JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT (Municipal Administrative Corporate state/Republic of Michigan), (Municipal Administrative Corporate state/Republic of Michigan Employee), (Municipal Administrative Corporate state/Republic of Michigan employee), MICHIGAN DEPARTMENT OF MOTOR VEHICLES (DMV); all Judicial Subdivisions; Officials; Agents; and above named Plaintiffs cases and Jurisdiction / Venue moved to Federal Court. All Matters, Complaints, Traffic Tickets/ Suits, Citations/ Bills of Exchange (misrepresented as lawful warrants etc.), must be filed with Federal Court pursuant to Jurisdiction named hereinafter.

1.

JURISDICTION

Jurisdiction / Venue are hereby placed in one Supreme Court, pursuant to Article III

Section 2 for the united states Republic, and the several States, under the Constitution; Article

VI and reaffirmed by obligatory Official Oaths. And states as follow:

"The Judicial Powers shall extend to all cases, in law and equity, arising under this Constitution, the laws of the UNITED STATES, and Treaties made, or which shall be made, under their authority;— to all cases affecting Ambassadors, other Public Ministers and Consuls;—to all cases of admiralty and maritime jurisdictions;— to controversies to which the United States shall be a party;— to controversies between two or more states;— between a state and citizens of another state;— between citizens of another state;— between citizens of different state;— between citizens of the same state claiming lands under grants of different states, and between a state, or the citizens thereof, and foreign states, citizens or subjects."

The Court has Jurisdiction over claims of violation of federal constitutional and statutory violations under 42 U.S.C.A. 1331 (a) and 1343. Furthermore, the court's jurisdiction is vested within defendants political Corporate, Bible the (UNIFORM COMMERCIAL CODE) as adopted in this political corporate state/Republic of Michigan.

The Court has (Supplemental Jurisdiction) over Plaintiff's state/or/republic of Michigan tort, statutory and common law claims under 28 U.S.C.A. 1367. The court's jurisdiction is defined pursuant to 28 U.S.C.A. 1391 and MCR2.112 (J) Pleading Special Matters, MCR 2.201(B),(C), MCR 2.203, MCR 2.227, and MCR 4.002(A). The court has jurisdiction over plaintiff's equity claims under the "Clean up Doctrine" to decide both equitable and Legal claims, since the legal issues are ancillary to the equitable ones. The court has jurisdiction over all of plaintiffs claims under the "Constitutional fact-Doctrine," over Administrative agencies findings of fact, since the facts involve whether the plaintiffs exceeded constitutional limitations on its powers concerning respondents IN REM or IN PERSONAM Rights.

The court has Personal (Supplemental Jurisdiction) over plaintiffs state/or/Republic of Michigan tort, statutory, criminal and civil claims under (Article III clause of the Constitution), to the united states of America. Since the injury-in-fact requirement is actual, and not hypothetical. The plaintiff invokes this court's jurisdiction under the given premise, this (Indigenous Moorish-American Citizen/Secured Party/Respondent) is the Rightful Master of Both Congress and Courts, not to overthrow the Constitution of the united states of America but to overthrow the Men and women who pervert the Constitution. Furthermore, the Constitution for the USA is the law of the land for the united states of America.(See Martin v. Waddell, 42 US (16 pet) 367 (1892): Hale v. Henkel 201 U.S. 43 (1905).

All cases affecting ambassadors, other Public Ministers and Consuls, and those in which a state shall be a party, the Supreme Court shall have Original Jurisdiction. In all the other cases before mentioned, the Supreme Court shall have appellate jurisdiction, both as to law and fact, with such exceptions, and under such regulations as the Congress shall make.

THE TREATY OF PEACE AND FRIENDSHIP OF 1836 A.D. BETWEEN MOROCCO AND THE UNITED STATES

ARTICLE 20

"If any of the Citizens of the United States, or any Person under the Protection shall have any dispute with each other, the Consul shall decide between the Parties, and whenever the Consul shall require any Aid or Assistance from our Government, to enforce his decisions it shall be immediately granted Him."

ARTICLE 21

"If any Citizen of the United States should Kill or wound a Moor, or on the contrary, if a Moor shall kill or wound a Citizen of the United States, the Law of the Country shall take place, and Equal Justice shall be rendered, the Consul assisting at the Trial; and if any Delinquent shall make his escape, the Consul shall not be answerable for him in any manner whatever."

ADMINISTRATIVE VENUE

The Courts (Subject Matter) and (Cause of Action) invoking the Courts jurisdiction "Arose" in the City of Detroit, County of Wayne, in a Territory of Michigan, and the pertinent Corporate/or/Privateer Plaintiff's involved in this action inhabited a portion of the land called the Republic of Michigan therein. The courts statutory provisions of (venue jurisdictional) rest before the court pursuant to 28 USCA 1391, (a) (c), 1392 and 1393. The Courts Jurisdiction is regarded as a "Residual" basis of venue for this "transitory" action, and venue has been properly laid herein except as otherwise specifically provided by law.

The plaintiff is not a trust, is not an attorney representing a trust, and is not holding office in a trust, of a <u>Title of Nobility</u>, nor is an official or an officer in a trust over which either the <u>United</u>

States Corporation: 1871, the STATE OF MICHIGAN, the <u>Municipal-Corporation</u> of the <u>STATE</u>

OF MICHIGAN or <u>Great Britain</u> as a <u>Holder-in-Due Course</u>. [see <u>Title 28 USC sec. 3001</u>, sec. 15],

"United means a <u>Federal Corporation</u>."

COMMON LAW VEHICULAR JUDICIAL NOTICE

CONSTITUTIONAL DRIVERS LICENSE ANSWER AND COUNTER CLAIM

The Undersigned Indigenous Moorish-American National Bobby Deandre Davis-Bey, Hereby Certifies, Rights Secured under Treaty of Peace & Friendship of 1787 and Under the Organic Assembly of 'We the The People' and Successors; Through and under provisions of the Declaration of Independence anno-Domini: 1776, The Constitution of the united states of America: Anno-Domini: 1791, The Articles of the Bill of Rights Anno-Domini: 1791, An ACT for the establishment of Government of Michigan: anno-Domini: 1835, The Northwest Ordinance: anno-Domini: 1787, [1 stat. sec. 1 and 2 Civil Flag of Peace of America [Title 28 U.S.C. sec. 1603].

- 1.) The Respondent, is a Natural-Born: Moorish-American: Sentient Being and Man on the Land (Jus Soli) of the <u>united states of America</u>, anno-Domini: 1791, is retaining and asserting ALL of the Inherent-Liberties and un-lien-able rights endowed by YHWH/ YAHWEH the Creator.
- 2.) The Plaintiff claims of Liberty precedes by the Blood-Birth (Origo Sanguinis), and Moorish Blood line extending time Immemorial, and prior to the establishment of the Municipal-Corporation of the District of Columbia, aka United States, aka UNITED STATES in: anno-Domini: 1871.
- 3.) The Plaintiff is not a party of the Constitution of the United States as amended anno-Domini: 1791, or the United States Corporate Constitution adopted as a bylaw in: 1871, the Constitution of the STATE OF MICHIGAN or the Constitution of the Municipal- Corporation of the STATE OF MICHIGAN.

- 4.) Plaintiff is not able lawfully, in the using of the Private-Copy Right UNITED STATES CODES, MICHIGAN COMPILED LAWS ANNOTATED, or the court rules of the procedures, because the plaintiff is NOT a party to any written bi-lateral contracts being voluntarily signed by the plaintiff creating a contractual obligation with the Holder of the copyrights for the United States Code, The Michigan Compiled Laws Annotated and or the Court Rules of the procedures, wherein the plaintiff is being authorized personally to use the said Private copyrighted material.
- is guaranteed as a RIGHT and not a mere privilege that the right to travel is such a Basic right it does not even need to be mentioned for it is Self-evident by Common Sense that the Right to Travel is a basic ConCom? Vitiate of Free Society to come and from length and breadth freely unencumbered and unfettered distinguishes the characteristics required for a Free-People to exist. (See Sharpio v. Thompson, 394 U.S. 618.

In, Shapiro v. Thompson, 394 U.S. 618 (1969), was a Supreme Court decision that helped to establish a fundamental "right to travel" in U.S. law. Although the Constitution does not mention the right to travel, it is implied by the other rights given in the Constitution. (Although the right was recognized under the Equal Protection Clause in this case, pre-Fourteenth Amendment, the right to travel was understood as protected by the Privileges and Immunities Clause (Article IV), as a privilege of citizenship, and therefore might have been applied to the states under the Privileges or Immunities Clause of Amendment XIV, as J. Stewart wanted.)

Freedom of Movement under United States law is governed primarily by the Privileges and Immunities Clause of the United States Constitution which states, "The Citizens of each State SHALL be entitled to ALL Privileges and Immunities of Citizens in the several States." As far back as the circuit court ruling in Corfield v. Coryell, 6 Fed. Cas. 546 (1823), the Supreme Court recognized freedom of movement as a fundamental Constitutional right.

In Paul v. Virginia, 75 U.S. 168 (1869), the Court defined freedom of movement as "right of free ingress into other States, and egress from them." However, the Supreme Court did not invest the federal government with the authority to protect freedom of movement. Under the "privileges and immunities" clause, this authority was given to the states, a position the Court held consistently through the years in cases such as Ward v. Maryland, 79 U.S. 418 (1871), the Slaughter-House Cases, 83 U.S. 36 (1873) and United States v. Harris, 106 U.S. 629 (1883).

In Kent v. Dulles, 357 U.S. 116 (1958), the United States Secretary of State had refused to issue a passport to an American citizen based on the suspicion that the plaintiff was going abroad to promote communism (personal restrictions/national security). Although the Court did not reach the question of constitutionality in this case, Justice William O. Douglas held that the federal government may not restrict the right to travel without due process:

The right to travel is a part of the 'liberty' of which the citizen cannot be deprived without due process of law under the Fifth Amendment. If that "liberty" is to be regulated, it must be pursuant to the law-making functions of the Congress. Freedom of movement across frontiers in either direction, and inside frontiers as well, was a part of our heritage. Travel abroad, like travel within the country . . . may be as close to the heart of the individual as the choice of what he eats, or wears, or reads. Freedom of movement is basic in our scheme of

values.

The International Bill of Human Rights is an informal name given to the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (adopted in 1948), the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (1966) with its two Optional Protocols, and the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (1966).

Article 13 of the **Universal Declaration of Human Rights** reads:

- (1) Everyone has the right to freedom of movement and residence within the borders of each State.
- (2) Everyone has the right to leave any country, including his own, and to return to his country.

Article 12 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights incorporates this right into treaty law:

- (1) Everyone **lawfully** within the **territory** of a State shall, within that territory, have the **right to liberty** of **movement** and **freedom** to choose his residence.
- (2) Everyone **shall** be free to leave any country, including his own.
- (3) The above-mentioned rights shall not be subject to any restrictions except those provided by law, are necessary to protect national security, public order (ordre publique), public health or morals or the rights and freedoms of others, and are consistent with the other rights recognized in the present Covenant.
- (4) No one shall be arbitrarily deprived of the right to enter his own country.

Article 15. Of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights states:

- 1.) Everyone has a right to a Nationality
- 2.) And no one shall be Arbitrarily deprived of his Nationality nor denied the right to change their Nationality.
- 6.) I Bobby DeAndre Davis Bey, presenting the COMPLAINT against the complaint as severed upon the DEFENDANTS, whom inhabits a portion of the land called the Republic of Michigan. The agents for the City of SOUTHFIELD did inhabit the Free Passage of Bobby DeAndre Davis Bey on 08/05/2013 at or about 11:25 my vessel was detained by SOUTHFIELD Police officer TAYLOR #10 (08817) & MATATALL #52 (05364) who engaged in an illegal Traffic stop on the date and time in Question at or near S/B EVERGREEN RD, W/B 10 MILE WEST OF NORTHWESTERN Hwy, in the COUNTY OF OAKLAND, was seized and detained AND TASED by said known defendants and given 3 Local Ordinance Violation. Upon issuance if the citation I was booked and Processed into a foreign enclave and kidnaped and held for a ransom of \$1500 all being done while plaintiff was under Threat, Duress and Coercion. The night in question plaintiff was demanded to role his window down and was demanded by 2 officer stated above to place his hands out of the window with his hand outside the windows plaintiff did as he was told and upon approach by defendants he was snatched out of his car and tased by the officers which caused him to fall to the ground and causing plaintiff to reinjured himself from a previous injury. Upon arriving at the police station plaintiff was stripped placed in a

cell, and after 10 to 20 minutes plaintiff was approached by booking officers for booking. Plaintiff refused to cooperate, was never given his Miranda Warning by ANY officers of the SOUTHFIELD POLICE STATION, but COERCIED by said officers in order to lay claim and seizure of his property and person to EXPAND FUNDS for its corporate agents. Plaintiff was placed in segregation and never give any medical attention. Plaintiff was later approached by a head official was COERCIED by official who stated: "That if Plaintiff surrounded his fingerprints he would be released. Plaintiff was Printed and released in the early a.m. Upon released he was transported to Beaumont Hospital in Royal Oak, Michigan Territory. Plaintiff pulled over in Territory in Novi, Michigan was arrested detained by NOVI POLICE. Plaintiff was given a RAMDSOM of \$500 and a date of APPEARANCE to return another foreign enclave known as the 46th DISITRICT COURT for case 13-30091, in which Jurisdiction was without and assumed Falsely by the said defendant in this said subject matter, which was done in violation of Plaintiff's Constitutionally Protected Rights to the United States of American Republic form of Government. Evidence of these violations of rights belonging unto the plaintiff is in dispute by the plaintiff and defendants.

AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

NO EFFECTIVE SERVICE OF THE COMPLAINT AND SUMMOMS

7.) The <u>De-facto</u> defendants failed in effective service of summons upon **Bobby**DeAndre Davis Bey, by the Defendants.

- 8.) The requirement upon the defendants under MCR 2.102, MCR 2.201, imposes the duty of presenting signed consent for service of summons before there may be effective service of summons. Defendants has NO consent of service of summons by Bobby DeAndre Davis Bey.
- 9.) MCR 2.102, "Summons, Dismissal of Action for Failure to serve." MCR 2.105 states: Process, Manner of service, Provides for No alternative method of summons. Because of Lack of alternative service of summons the complaint must be dismissed. Failure by not stating the claim for which relief can be granted for the defendants.
- 10.) The defendants fails in this action by not stating a claim for which relief may be granted. Plaintiff is NOT a Resident of the Corporate STATE OF MICHIGAN and is therefore NOT under the Jurisdiction of the court that the defendants chose for bringing suit.

JURY TRIAL DEMAND

11.) The Seventh (7) Amendment to the united states of America Constitution provides in all suits at equity and common law, where the value in controversy shall exceed twenty (20) dollars the Right to Trial by Jury shall be preserved. Furthermore, the Seventh Amendment guarantees the Right to a Jury trial in <Federal Court> Civil Rights Claims, equity claims, and Constitutional claims for money damages or other relief against government officials or other private individuals. (see Curtis v. Loether, 415 U.S. 189, 94 S.Ct 1005 (1974), Dolence v.

Flynn, 628 F.2d 1280 (1980).

11.

NOTICE OF DEMAND OF RIGHT TO TRAVEL

Allegations of Constitutional violations to the United States of America:

1.) Now Comes, Bobby DeAndre Davis Bey, In Propria Persona, Sui Juris; Aboriginal, Indigenous Moorish American National, Freehold by Inheritance with Birthrights and protected and secured Inalienable Rights, makes with the NOTICE OF REMOVEL of the u-Unconstitutional Complaint-Summons/Ticket-Suit/ Bill of Exchange / case number# 14-21779. Petitioner is with reasonable expectation that the Officials holding any position of Trust, or political office, are prohibited, under Official Oath, under the authority of The Law of the Land, from the use of the official position(s) or office(s) to violate the Constitution for the UNITED STATES OF AMERICA; and thus, by the abuse of authority, and the practice of superseding their 'limited' jurisdictional powers, violate and abridge the Natural, Divine, Unalienable, and Secured Rights of the People; terminating with cause of damage to this Petitioner/Plaintiff/ Secured Party declares:

I do not qualify for **State Driver's License**, **I.D.** or other **Travel Documents**, because the State Requires first, that I voluntarily engage in business with the Social Security Administration of the U.S. so that may be numbered by them. Plaintiff claims that he is a **lawfully Registered** Citizen of **the Moorish National and Divine Movement** of **North, South** and **Central America's etc**.

- 2.) Plaintiff claims that he has allegiance with a foreign Nation and any use of such name associated with the Factious Corporate Entity know as BOBBY DIANDRA DAVIS will expire in the year of 2015 and will not be renewed with the Corporate State of MICHIGAN and any use of such will be done under THREAT, DURESS and COERCION.
- 3.) Respondent claims, the Right to Travel, by Private conveyance for Private purposes upon the Common Way can NOT BE INFRINGED. No license or permission is required to Travel when such Travel IS NOT for the purpose of [COMMERCIAL] PROFIT or GAIN on the open Highways operating under license IN COMMERCE, the above named Common Law Moorish American Citizen listed IS NOT OPERATING IN COMMERCE and as such is thereby EXEMPT FROM THE REQUIRED INTENT OF A LICENSE as such.

Furthermore, the **STATE OF MICHIGAN** is **forbidden by Law** form converting a Basic Right into a Privilege and requiring a License and or fee charged for the exercise of the Basic Right. (See **Murdock v. Pennsylvania 319 U.S. 105**) which stated:

"A state may not impose a charge for the enjoyment of a right granted by the federal constitution. Thus, it may not exact a license tax for the privilege of carrying on interstate commerce (McGoldrick v. Berwind-White Co., 309 U.S. 33, 56-58, 60 S.Ct. 388, 397, 398, 128 A.L.R. 876),

And if THE STATE OF MICHIGAN does ERRONEOUSLY CONVERT Basic Rights into Privileges and require a license or fee a citizen may INGORE the license or fee with TOTAL IMMUNITY for such exercise of a basic right. (see Shuttleworth v. BIRMINGHAM, 373 U.S. 262.). Which was reversed by the Supreme Court and stated that: the convictions of Gober and Davis were constitutionally invalid. In Gober v. City of Birmingham, 373 U.S.

- 374, 83 S.Ct. 1311, which was held on the authority of Peterson v. City of Greenville, 373 U.S. 244, 83 S.Ct. 1119. Now if a Citizen exercise a Basic Right, the said supposed law of ANY STATE is to contrary of such exercise of that Basic right, the said supposed law of any State is a FICTION OF LAW and 100% Totally Unconstitutional Law or license requirement, (See; Marbury vs. Madison, 5, U.S. 137 (1803), which has NEVER been OVERTURNED in 197 years.
 - 4.) Now further, if a citizen of a Free National Republic, relies in good faith on the advice of counsel and or on the decisions of the UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT that citizen has a perfect Defense to the elements of WILLFULNESS and since the BURDEN OF PROOF of said WILLFULNESS is on the prosecution to prove beyond a Reasonable DOUBT. Said task or burden being totally impossible to specifically perform there is NO Cause of Action which Relief can be granted by a court of law. [See U.S. v. Bishop, 412 U.S. 346.] Obviously there is No lawful charge against exercising a Basic right to Travel for a Moorish-American citizen is IMMUNED from any charge to the contrary and ANY Party making such charge should be Duty Warned of the Tort of Trespass!!!
 - 5.) The original and Judicial Jurisdiction of the United States Supreme Court In ALL ACTIONS in which a States may be party through subdivision, political or trust. This includes All State approved subdivisions and or INCORPORATED Cities, Townships, Municipalities, and Villages, et. Al. See ARTICLE 3 SEC. 2, Para (1) & (2), U.S. Constitution.

6.) Plaintiff is invoking his RIGHT TO PRIVACY. Supreme Court decisions over the years have established that right to Privacy is a Basic Right, and as such is protected by virtue of the 9th Amendment. The Right to Privacy has come to the Public's attention via several controversial Supreme Court rulings including several dealings with contraceptive (The Griswold & Eisenstaedt, and abortion the well know ROE v. WADE cases. In addition, it is said that the Right to privacy is inherent in many of the Amendments in the Bill of Rights, such as the 3rd, 4th's search and seizures limits, and the 5th's Self Incrimination limits.

FREEDOM OF MOVEMENT BETWEEN PRIVATE PARTIES

- 7.) There is a converse duty for a **Private Person** not to impede the Free Movement of Another. Where a person prevents another from freely leaving an area, either by physically imprisoning them or **by threats**, that person **may** be **subject** to a **Lawsuit for false imprisonment**, and a **criminal charge** for **kidnapping**.
- 8.) The Supreme Court notes in Saenz v. ROE, 98-97 526 U.S. 489 (1999)
 134 F.3d 1400, affirmed. The constitution does not contain the word "Travel" in any content, let alone an explicit right to Travel (except for members of Congress, who are guaranteed the right to travel to and from Congress). The presumed right to travel, however, is firmly established in U.S. law precedent. In U.S. v. Guest, 383 U.S. 745 (1966), the court noted:

"It is a Right that has been firmly established and repeatedly recognized." In fact, In **Shapiro v. Thompson**, **394b U.S. 618 (1969)**, Justice **Stewart** noted in a concerning opinion that 'it is a right broadly assertable against private interference as well government action, like the right of Association...it is a virtually unconstitutional personal rights, guaranteed by the Constitution **to us ALL**". It is interesting to note that the **Articles of Confederation** had an explicit Right to Travel. It is now thought that the right is so fundamental that the Farmers may have thought it unnecessary to include it in the **Constitution** or the **Bill of Rights**.

- 9.) Plaintiff contends that he does have an explicit stated Constitutional Right to Travel within the country, since he is not restricted from interstate travel, the 10th Amendment says I have the Right anyway. It could be argued that ARTICLE 4. SEC. 2, CLAUSE 1. Presumes the Right to Travel between states when it says that a Citizen of one state SHALL have ALL the Rights of a Citizen of another state.
- is a FRAUD and is in clear and direct conflict with the United States Constitution, The SUPREME LAW OF THE LAND. Laws made by any state, which are clearly in direct Conflict or REPUGNANCY are Constitutional and are NOT WITH STANDING IN LAW and are being CHALLENGED AS SUCH HERE AND THERBY ARE NULL AND VOID of law on THEIR FACE, NO COURTS ARE BOUND to UPHOLD such FICTIONS OF LAW and NO citizen is bound to obey such a fiction of law. Such regulations or Law operates as a mere nullity or Fiction of law as if it never existed in law. No

citizen is bound to obey such unconstitutional law!!!

- 11.) Plaintiff implements his 4th Amendment Right to the Constitution to the Right to be secure from search and seizure. In violation of the fruit of poisonous tree doctrine which is a legal metaphor in the United States used to describe evidence that is obtained illegally. Plaintiff contends that the officers in this matter violated his Rights under the 4th Amendment to the constitution by searching his person.
- 12.) De Jure plaintiff seeks damages and equitable relief under 42 USC 1983 and other equitable doctrines, alleging the (Intentional Deprivation of Freedom of Movement, Rights to Privacy, and illegal search and seizure. In violation to the 4th, 5th & 9th Amendments to the Constitution. Furthermore these privateer defendants proximately caused the breach of this (Moorish-American Citizen) contract with the above stated Articles of the Constitution, which was established (a die confectionis), was WITHOUT RECOURSE.
- 13.) The De fecto defendants ("Intentionally obstructed") his Life, Liberty, and pursuit of Happiness violating the 4th, 5th, and 9th Amendments to the United States of America Constitution. In conjunction, this Moorish-American common law citizen alleges the "Determinative Influences" of these defendants decision to "Willfully" seize and detain plaintiff's person violation of the Equal Protections clause of the united states of America Constitution.
- 14.) Furthermore, plaintiff claims that these de facto defendants committed various violations of statutory Laws/Rights, of the united states of America ranging from 18 USC 241 & 242(5). Herein, the De facto defendants directly/or/indirectly

conspired together during and afterword's to "willful" dis-enfranchised this citizen from the (free exercise of enjoyment) of his rights secured by the Constitution or laws of the united states of America.

- Exempt Private Property of plaintiffs was "Prima facie" under color of office and color of law to extort contributions of money, information and other booty for a foreign principal, who is attempting to disguise his or her true nature. Therefore, plaintiff alleges the defendants acted as privateer(s) in their personal capacity, in violation of Title 18 USCA sec. 241 &242, Title 28 USCA 1343, Title 42 USCA 1981 & 1985 to the Constitution of the united states of America and the Republic of Michigan Constitution.
- by extortion upon Bobby DeAndre Davis Bey, in direct violation of the protections contained within Title 28 USCA sec. 1349 & 1350, Title 28 USCA 1356 & 1357, Title 28 USCA 1362, of plaintiffs IN REM or IN PERSONAM Rights as such, these de facto defendants knew that an assessment upon exempt Private Real and personal property as contained within the statute/merchant to which these defendants authority is limited and restricted, and confined by other law contained within our original Constitution of the Country of Michigan In 1865, 1866, & 1867, could never be destroyed or sold or given away to another, especially upon plaintiffs Notice and knowledge of the "Special Status" of Allodial Private absolute owner with the rights of possession by absolute inheritance from GOD.

17.)These **De facto** defendants also knew or should have known they failed to conform to **Title 5 USCA sec. 101 & 102**, **notwithstanding any conflicting**Michigan state statutes as stated in (section 101): Oaths by members of legislature and officers:

"Every member of state legislature and every executive and judicial officer of the state shall before he/she proceeds to execute the duties of his office, take an oath in the following form to writ:"

"I do Solemnly swear that I will support the Constitution of the United States (July 30, 1947, ch. 389, 81 stat. 643 section 102 same manner, as by law of the state, he is directed to record or certify the Oath of office." (July 30, 1947, ch. 389, stat. 644)... with the Secretary of State.

- 18.) Plaintiff alleges that the de facto, defendants agree their lawful authority for committing these willful, knowing and Intentional acts is limited by statute and restrained therein and in preview of the "Allodial status" of Bobby DeAndre Davis Bey.
- 19.)These de facto defendants did not have any legal authority to attempt/nor/ execute the restrain of plaintiff absolute liberty in any way whatsoever, as the defendants knew, they were duty bound under the original Constitution of Michigan in the years of 1865 1866 and 1867, to which the defendants publicly sworn upon oath/contract/bond and owe allegiance and whereas plaintiff alleges the defendants must immediately cease and desist in this unlawful detainer and forcible entry as well as the libel and slander it is causing against the plaintiff, MASTER Bobby DeAndre Davis Bey, a citizen of the country of

Michigan Republic form of Government in the state of the forum UCC 1-105. Defendants bonded specific performance in their failure of any consideration sufficient to support a single contract under UCC-204 (44)(d) through principles of UCC-1-103 in this forum UCC -1-105 Common Law this private detainer against Bobby DeAndre Davis Bey.

20.)Plaintiff alleges the wanton, and willful conduct of the defendants was reckless and proximately caused plaintiff extreme grief, shame, humiliation, embarrassment, anger, disappointment, worry, nausea and outrageous suffering, invoking the Federal/and/State Doctrine of (Emotional distress), in violation of the Common Law Doctrine of the REPUBLIC OF Michigan and is confirmed by state or Federal Common Law doctrines.

Invoking Equitable and Special Exceptions Doctrine(s):

Defendants de facto, willfully, and deliberately violated numerous laws, and plaintiff exerts the "Adequacy Doctrine," of the Judiciary ACT of 1789, and incorporated into every statute and decision in every American jurisdiction.

21.) Plaintiff contends All Judges and Attorneys claim to be licensed by the state, but NO STATE OF MICHIGAN agency shows proof of such License, and Dept. of Licensing & Regulation states that they do not license attorneys or Judges, but that they are licensed through the STATE BAR OF MICHIGAN, and it is stated that such can be found in the Michigan Court Rules concerning the State Bar of Michigan, [Rule 15, section 3, part (3)]:

"Admission to the Bar of the state is an attorney and counselor in every court in this state." Nowhere does it indicate a license, and in fact the **Michigan Supreme Court** clearly states that, neither do they or the State Bar issues "License." While however, [Articles 6. Sec. 9 of the Michigan Constitution of 1963], which specifies that such Judges shall be persons who are licensed to practice law in this state."

22.)The Michigan Supreme Court states that: "In order to be qualified to practice law, an attorney must be admitted into the State Bar of Michigan, but must also pay the requisite dues and receive an identifying P-number. It is the dual statute of admission to the bar and active membership in the State Bar of Michigan which together constitutes the License" to practice law in the state. This in and of itself is a direct violation of the Michigan Constitution, since there is no actual license to practice law as an attorney or judge in the State of Michigan. The State has issued a Public Hazard Bond (P-Number), which is an (insurance Policy) to attorneys. Attorneys operate under a state issued bond under Letters of Marque, and Public Hazard Bond Numbers.

The Insurance Company thereby subrogates all Rights and Defenses on the Bonds/
Insurance policy whereby all negotiable Instruments are subrogated to the STATE and
the UNITED STATES, via the judge as the trustee. This permits the 'de facto agents
to act under the 'color of law', thereby EXPANDING FUNDS for the Corporation
of the UNITED STATES: by using PUBLIC POLICY, and for the TRADING
WITH THE ENEMY ACT 1917, who issued license for the Courts of the STATE OF
MICHGAN to do business under FEDEAL CONTRACT.

23.) [TRADING WITH THE ENEMYACT: 1917 SEC. 6]: states that:

The President is Authorized to Empower an Alien property custodians to receive all money and property in the United States due or belonging to an enemy, or ally of enemy which may be paid, conveyed, transferred, assigned, or delivered to said custodian under the provisions of this act. The alien property Custodian shall give such bond or bonds and in such form and amount, and with such security as the President shall subscribe.

24.]By discovery of law, President FRANKLIN D. ROSEVELT declared the United States Bankruptcy by Presidential Executive Order 6073, on the 10th Day of March 1933, and subsequent Executive Orders, 6102, 6111 and 6260. [House Joint Resolution 192, 5th Day of June 1933], [Public Res. No. 10], [Public Law 73-10 1st session]. Thereby the agents of the Municipal-Corporation, who are an overlay or enclave of the United States Government, have assumed that this Moorish-American Bobby DeAndre Davis-Bey is in agreement under tort law, that he is a contributor to the National Debt and a wrong doer under the Trading with the Enemy Act of 1917.

25.)[The Fourteenth Amendment] created federal citizenship, which makes it illegal for federal citizens to question the National Debt. [see Clause 4, of 14th Amendment]. This Moorish-American National Citizen is Not a [14th Amendment citizen] as assumed by the de facto agents of the municipal-corporation of Wayne County. All the Above mentioned agents of the municipal-corporation have taken an unfair advantage in the case/account No: 13-30091, to Expand Funds for the United States, by creating a spurious debt, and manipulating the sentient being by means of CAPIAS AD

SATISFACIENDUM (Body execution), and as collateral and surety for the Debt, that they might subrogate him as surety for the debt, and in exchange for the use of the (STRAMINNEUS HOMO) (TRANSMITTING UTILITY), and the Tax Exemption attached thereto, under [26 USC sec. 163]. Therefore, a crime/liability was created by agents of the STATE OF MICHIGAN, law enforcement agents, and Judicial officials, to manufacture a crime in order to obtain the defendants wrongful conviction/fine, and to expand funds for the UNITED STATES CORPORATION.

- **26.**)By discovery of law, it is well established evidentiary presumption that all "Public Servants," such as the Judges and Prosecutors involved in the proceedings against the plaintiff/victim, referred to as "violators." Are presumed to act within the limits of the law and not to exceed their authority, and such presumptions is no substitute for evidentiary facts. Unless rebutted, violators DID NOT act within the law and did exceed their authority when causing a "FRAUDULENT SECURITY" to be filed against the plaintiff, and a "TAX LIEN" which does not raise out of a valid "ASSESSMENT" is a "FRAUDULENT SECURITY" within the meaning of [Title 18 USC sec. 513 (a)].
- **27.)** The Act committed under **fraud**, **force** and **seizure**, was done under "**Letters of Marque and Reprisal**" i.e., "**Recapture**." [see 31 USCA sec. 5323] such principles as "**Fraud and Justice never dwell together**," and "a Right of Action cannot arise out of **FRAUD**," and do not rightfully contemplate the thought concept as "**DUE PROCESS**," "**Just Compensation**" and justice itself

and [Title 26 USC sec. 7809] states that:

"Any money received under the Internal Revenue Law is to be paid into the U.S. Treasury daily and says nothing whatsoever about money collected under fraudulent contracts when the 'de facto' agents/officials acted on behalf of the STATE OF MICHIGAN, WAYNE COUNTY, CITY OF DETROIT and the Municipal Corporations, and the UNITED STATES CORPORATION, is acting under BANKRUPTCY and [House Joint Resolution 192], [Public Law 73-10], and under Public Policy to use the tax exemption under [26 USC sec. 163], to expand funds for the UNITED STATES Corporation and create a liability/debt to be SOLD on the open market using the ens legis (Bobby Davis) a TRANSMITTING UTILITY, and Social Security number attached thereto.

- 28. Plaintiff is a Moorish-American National, and Citizen for the Free-National Republic of Michigan, was and is being forced under extreme Duress to perform under a "Fraudulent Security," while being detained, by the above mentioned 'de facto' Honorable, and his Agents and Confidantes, who acted under a Fraudulent Military Jurisdiction. Such acts if performed will be within a MILITARY STYLE TRIBUNAL (Courtroom), when causing Injury and Damages to the plaintiff.
- 29. Nowhere in [AMY REGULATION 840-10] concerning the Positional Colors Flag does it list the STATE COURTS as having the Authority to display this Flag, thereby acting Without Authorization or Jurisdiction as a military tribunal, subject to the military and their laws and by-laws for the enlisted and commissioned officers and the likes. The Several Defendants/Co-conspiritors

therein will be acting as Military officials, and thereby acted under "Color of Law" which therein will render the Final results and Disposition of the above case No: 13-30091 NULL and VOID. Since all proceedings will and have been being conducted on 06/02/2014 will be without the proper Authorization of Jurisdiction from the Military according to the [UNIFORM CODE OF MILITARY JUSTICE], and [ARMY REGULATION S 840-10]. The use of the Positional Colors Flag is used as a form of deception, and is AN ACT of perfidy by which they lose ALL CLAIM to protections of the laws. The WAYNE COUNTY 36TH DISTRICT COURT is posturing under the guise of a Military Tribunal which is under the direction of the President of the United States: BARRAK OBAMA!!!

30.) The responsibility for conducting military operations goes from the President who is Commander-in- Chief, to the Secretary of Defense directly to the heads of the Unified combatant commands, and the Joint Chiefs of Staff act in advisory capacity within THE LIBER CODE OF 1863. Section II- Protections of Persons... (42). Slavery complicating and confounding the ideas of Property (that is, of a thing), and of personality that is, of humanity exist according to municipal or local law only. The law of Nature and Nations has never acknowledged it. The digest of the Roman law enacts the early dictum of the Pagan Jurist, that "So far as the law of nature is concerned, "ALL MEN ARE CREATED EQUAL." Therefore, it is incumbent upon the president who is the head of the military and the United States Corporation to Protect the Indigenous Moorish-American National, from these 'de facto' agents who

under federal contract with the United States.

- and 19, for the Constitution of the STATE OF MICHIGAN is Prohibited under [Article I sec. 10, of the 15th Amendment of the Constitution] for the united states of America, Anno-Domini: and [Article I sec. 11, 18, and 19, for the Constitution of the STATE OF MICHIGAN], from making and/or enforcing any laws compelling the plaintiff involuntarily into any contractual-agreement by creating an obligation by force compelling the performance and imposing cruel and unjust punishment and this indigenous Moorish-Americans property being taken away without just compensation, decency, Security and Liberty alike demands that governmental officials SHALL be subjected to the same Rules of Conduct that are commands to the citizens a government will be imperiled if it fails to observe the law scrupulously. Fraud within the court, in this matter will/or shall subvert the integrity of the court itself, and corrupts the Judicial machinery, which it is impossible for it to perform in an impartial manner, and thereby bring about justice and liberty on behalf of this Moorish American.
- 32.) "The Constitution DOES NOT protect the Sovereignty of the States for the benefit of the STATE or STATE GOVERNMENTS as abstract political entities, or even for the benefit of the public officials governing the State's To the Contrary, the Constitution divides Authority between Federal & State Governments for the protections of individuals and indigenous citizens alike. Yet, this Indigenous Moorish Citizen for the People's Republic of Michigan and/or Michigan state Republic will be forced to stand and appear before

- an ARTICLE I Unconstitutional Court of the Law as proof of the herein evidence of the ongoing Conspiracy and Acts of TREASON & SEDITION against Bobby DeAndre Davis-Bey.
- to know the **general public laws** of the **STATE** and **COUNTRY** where they reside are by the effects of their acts, they should have known the laws and **Statutes** in regards to both **STATE OF MICHIGAN** and the **UNITED STATES** regarding **OATHS of Office**, as well as forcing a free Moorish-American National, to stand and appear before an **Article I Tribunal** with the **Positional GOLD FRINGED FLAG OF WAR** within the courtroom, instead of a **Constitutionally formatted Article III court of law** as prescribed by the **United States Constitution.** Herein the United States is bound to guarantee to each state a **Republic form of government**.
- 34.) To recover **Damages for injuries** to this **Indigenous Moorish** person and/or property, for the **Deprivation of his Unalienable Rights** as a **Common Law Citizen**, for **ACTS** done under **Conspiracy**, **Fraud & Detention**.

Plaintiff is **Not** a **UNITED STATES** Citizen or subject, or a subject of **Great Britain**, nor a **[14th Amendment]** "**Person**," or "Citizen Subject," under the Private Copyrighted: **Penal Codes**, statutes, and Amendments, while the aforementioned being foreign-law to the plaintiff. The unlawful-restraint of plaintiff's **inherent unalienable Rights [DEUS MEUMUUE JUS]** are crimes.

35.) NOTICE is being given that these citied Statutes & Treaties not being relied upon by the undersigned, Bobby DeAndre Davis-Bey, as a source of Rights,

and/or any use of **private copyrights**, but is being provided as courtesy for the proceeding in your Law-Form. Plaintiff has properly file a **UCC -1 financing**Statement MCLA 440.9 secured transactions file Number U200908080013, F.S. #2009115660-6 on file with the MICHIGAN SECRETARY OF STATE.

ADMINISTRATIVE RELIEF

The Enforcement of the following:

- 1.) The Divine Constitution and By-Laws of The Moorish National and Divine Movement; The Moorish Nation of North America; Act VI: By Being Moorish American, you are a Part and Parcel of this said government and Must Live the Life Accordingly; Article VI of the united states Constitution Republic/The Treaty of Peace and Friendship of EIGHTEEN HUNDRED and THIRTY-SIX A.D., Classifies Moorish Americans as Federal Citizens Possessing Freehold by Inheritance Status-Truth A-1. [See Article 3, section 2 of 'The Constitution for the United States of America."]
- 2.) I, Bobby DeAndre Davis-Bey, demand Due Process as protected by the Fourth (4th) and Fifth (5th) Amendments of the Constitution for the United States of America (Republic).
- 3.) I, Bobby DeAndre Davis-Bey, demand this United States Supreme Court/the United States District Court for the District of Michigan stop these abuses of the colorable authority by the Respondents as it pertains to this Petitioner.

- 4.) I, Bobby DeAndre Davis-Bey, demand if any criminal charges be found, let them be place upon the defendants.
- 5.) I, Bobby DeAndre Davis-Bey, demand this United States Supreme Court/the United State District Court for the District of Michigan in its Republic forum view this Petitioners (in my Proper Person) as a Moorish American National (Natural Born Citizen of the Land) and not as a (brand) NEGRO, BLACKMAN (person), COLORED, AFRICAN-AMERICAN, or any other SLAVE TITLE or "nom de guerre" imposed upon me for misrepresentation 'Actions' or other acts of 'Misprision' that a misdirected society may 'believe' to be true.
- 6.I, Bobby DeAndre Davis-Bey, do not, under any condition or circumstance, by threat, duress, or coercion, waive any Rights Inalienable or Secured by the Constitution or Treaty, and hereby requests the United States Supreme Court/ the United States District Court for the District of Michigan in its Republic forum to fulfill their Judicial Duty I 'Good faith' by ordering defendants to be brought before the Law to answer for their criminal and unjust actions.
- 7.) All UNCONSTITUTIONAL Citations, Ordinance's Summons/Tickets

 Suits / (misrepresented) Bills of Exchange Case No: 14-21779 And
 any other 'Order' or 'Action' associated with it/them, to be dismissed and
 expunged for the record on its face and merits; or, otherwise, be brought before
 a legitimately delegated, and competent 'Court of Law' of International
 Jurisdiction/Venue.

- 8.) All City, County and State Officials are to be informed of the Law of the Land (Constitution & Treaty) and their obligation to uphold the same and to no longer be excused without action on the part of the Sheriff for the violating the same. And to be made cognizance of the recompense of colorable actions on their part, by not adhering to the Law.
- 9.) Any defendants, Corporate or Natural, Party-Claimants; Involvements be found guilty of the charges and shall result in immediate Recusal of Office.

AWARD COMPENSATORY DAMAGES IN THE FOLLOWING AMOUNTS

- 10 Defendant STATE OF MICHIGAN is being sued for \$250,000 for compensatory damages and \$250,000 for Punitive Damages in its Official Capacity.
- 11.) Defendants CITY OF SOUTHFIELD, and its POLICE DEPTMENT agents, is being sued for \$250,000 for Compensatory Damages and \$250,000 for Punitive Damages in its Official Capacity.
- 12.) Defendants Judge JOHN DOE, is being sued in both Personal and Official Capacity for \$250,000 Compensatory Damages and \$250,000 for Punitive Damages in his Private capacity.
- 13. Defendant SOTAYLORM (TAYLOR MATTHEWS 08817), police Officer, is being sued in both his Personal and Official Capacity for \$250,000 for Compensatory Damages and \$250,000 for Punitive Damages in his Private capacity for tasering discharge onto plaintiff..
- 14.Defendant SOMATATALLB (MATATALL, BLAKE 08555), an agent for City of SOUTHFIELD, is being sued in both his Personal and Official

- Capacity for \$250,000 Compensatory Damages and \$250,000 for Punitive Damages in his Private capacity.
- 15.Defendant SCOTT KRAMER, an agent for City of SOUTHFIELD, is being sued in both his Personal and Official Capacity for \$250,000 Compensatory Damages and \$250,000 for Punitive Damages in his Private capacity.
- 16.Defendant JASON SCHNEIDER, an agent for City of SOUTHFIELD, is being sued in both his Personal and Official Capacity for \$250,000 Compensatory Damages and \$250,000 for Punitive Damages in his Private capacity.
- in both his **Personal** and **Official Capacity** for \$250,000 **Compensatory**Damages and \$250,000 for **Punitive Damages** in his Private capacity.
 - Defendant STATE OF MICHIGAN DEPARTMENT OF MOTOR VEHICLES (DMV) is being sued for \$250,000 for Compensatory

 Damages and \$250,000 for Punitive and for \$250,000 for Punitive

 Damages in his Private capacity.

TRIAL BY JURY OF MY PEERS WAS, AND IS DEMANDED

I declare under the penalty of perjury under the law of the **UNITED STATES CODES** that the above is true and correct to the best of my knowledge and honorable intent.

AFFIDAVIT

Affiant, a Moorish American National Aboriginal Indigenous Divine Being-Manifested in human flesh to Declare by virtue of Divine Law: under the laws of the united: states of America, anno: Domini 1791, and the United States Republic Constitution; and upon the Honor of our Fore-Mothers and Fore-Fathers that the above Affidavits, Motion and Counter Claims, and all Jurisdiction claims is true and correct to the best of my knowledge and honorable intent.

Respectfully submitted this /9 day of MAY, 1434 M.C.= (C.C.Y. 2014)

Thank You,

I Am: Bully Run Bu Bry

Bobby DeAndre Davis-Bey

Authorized Representative

Natural Person, In Propria Persona:

Ex Relatione: Bobby D. Davis (not a

Corporate Person or Entity, Misrepresented

By Fraudulent Construct of (ALL CAPITAL

LETTERS) All Rights Reserved: U.C.C. 1-207

/1-308/1-103

Michigan Territory

[C/O 17381 Stout

Detroit, Michigan [Zip Exempt] Non Domestic

Witness: Drother N. Barnes-Bey, Sheik

Natural Person-In Propria Person- All Rights Reserved

Natural Person-In Propria Person- All Rights Reserved

SAESHA MONET NIX
NOTARY PUBLIC - STATE OF MICHIGAN
COUNTY OF WAYNE
My Commission Expires May 17, 2020
Acting in the County of Wayne

Notary Public:

Moorish Seal:

42 | Page

Cc: United States Justice Dept.

United States Attorney General Eric H. Holder, Jr.

State of Michigan Governor Richard Dale "Rick" Snyder

State of Michigan Attorney General Bill Schuette

State of Michigan Secretary of State Ruth Johnson

United Nations High Commission Palais Wilson

International Justice Court The Hague, the Netherlands

International Criminal Courts Lusi Moreno-Ocampo the Hague, the Netherlands.

United States Department of State Hillary Rodham Clinton.

. 12/12)	Acv-12167-RHC	CIVIL C	OVE	R SHEET	C	County in which ac	tion arose <u>(27)</u>		
e JS 44 civil cover sheet and to provided by local rules of court. purpose of initiating the civil doc	he information contained he This form, approved by the cket sheet. (SEE INSTRUCT)	erein neither replace not be Judicial Conference of CONS ON NEXT PAGE OF	r supplem f the Unit THIS FOR	RM.)		or other papers as ed for the use of the	e Clerk of Court	for the	as
I. (a) PLAINTIFFS BULLY DUAC	re Davis Bey			DEFENDANTS 30 7AYLOR		TTHEW TAYL	or Et.AL		4
(b) County of Residence of	. 1	epublic Ewhys	NE]	County of Residence	of First Liste	d Defendant AINTIFF CASES ON ON CASES, USE THE	<u>NA 04</u> LY)	KIM	<u>"-</u> -
(c) Attorneys (Firm Name, A.	ddress, and Telephone Number, PERSONM			Attorneys (If Known)					
II. BASIS OF JURISDI	CTION (Place an "X" in Or	ne Box Only)	III. CI	TIZENSHIP OF I	PRINCIPA	L PARTIES (P	lace an "X" in On and One Box for l	e Box for	Plaintiff
□ 1 U.S. Government Plaintiff	Federal Question (U.S. Government N				TF DEF	Incorporated or Prin of Business In Th	cipal Place	TF I	DEF 4
2 U.S. Government Defendant	4 Diversity (Indicate Citizenshi)	p of Parties in Item III)	Citize	en of Another State	J 2	of Business In Ar			O 5
	•			en or Subject of a Creign Country	3 3 3	Foreign Nation		A 6	□ 6 —
IV. NATURE OF SUIT			1 170)RFEITURE/PENALTY	BAN	KRUPTCY	OTHER ST	ATUTE	S
CONTRAC1 ☐ 110 Insurance ☐ 120 Marine ☐ 130 Miller Act ☐ 140 Negotiable Instrument ☐ 150 Recovery of Overpayment	□ 330 Federal Employers' Liability □ 340 Marine □ 345 Marine Product Liability □ 350 Motor Vehicle □ 355 Motor Vehicle □ Product Liability □ 360 Other Personal Injury □ 362 Personal Injury - Medical Malpractice CIVIL RIGHTS □ 440 Other Civil Rights □ 441 Voting □ 442 Employment □ 443 Housing/ Accommodations □ 445 Amer. w/Disabilities - Employment □ 446 Amer. w/Disabilities - Other □ 448 Education	PERSONAL INJUR 365 Personal Injury - Product Liability 367 Health Care/ Pharmaccutical Personal Injury Product Liability 368 Asbestos Personal Injury Product Liability PERSONAL PROPEI 370 Other Fraud 371 Truth in Lending 380 Other Personal Property Damage 70 Janage 385 Property Damage 70 Alien Detainee 510 Motions to Vacat Sentence 530 General 535 Death Penalty 70 Other 540 Mandamus & Other 550 Civil Rights 555 Prison Condition 7560 Civil Detainee - Conditions of Confinement	Y	25 Drug Related Seizure of Property 21 USC 881 00 Other	422 Appe	cal 28 USC 158 drawal USC 157 RTY RIGHTS rrights ot emark	□ 375 False Clai □ 400 State Reag □ 410 Antitrust □ 430 Banks and □ 450 Commerc □ 460 Deportati □ 470 Racketeet Corrupt C □ 480 Consume □ 490 Cable/Sat □ 850 Securities Exchang Ø 890 Other Sta □ 891 Agricultu □ 893 Environn □ 895 Freedom Act □ 896 Arbitratic □ 899 Administ	ms Act pportionm I Banking oon r Influence prganizatic r Credit TV //Commode tuttory Act ral Acts mental Mat of Inform on rrative Pro- ew or App Decision ionality of	ed and ons ditties/ etions tters tation
	emoved from	Remanded from Appellate Court	Red	opened Anot (spec		6 Multidistr Litigation			
VI. CAUSE OF ACTION	1			(Do not cite jurisdictional s 12 b) WU ASSAUIHU	3y 1984	k and Kier	1983 Umpped no	H by n	לימוס קדי ניטו
VII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT:	CHECK IF THIS UNDER RULE	S IS A CLASS ACTIO		DOMEST BOOK	W.	CHECK YES only JURY DEMAND:	if demanded in	complain No	it: .
VIII. RELATED CAS	E(S) (See instructions):	JUDGE NA	l		DOCK	ET NUMBER	13-3000	1	
DATE O6/2/2014 FOR OFFICE USE ONLY		SIGNATURE OF A	TTORNEY	OF RECORD OF RECORD OF RECORD	savet_				
RECEIPT# A	MOUNT	APPLYING IFP		JUDGE		MAG. JU	DGE		

PURSUANT TO LOCAL RULE 83.11

1.	Is this a case that has been previously dismissed?	Yes No
If yes, give	the following information:	
Court:		
Case No.:		
Judge:		
2.	Other than stated above, are there any pending or previously discontinued or dismissed companion cases in this or any other court, including state court? (Companion cases are matters in which it appears substantially similar evidence will be offered or the same or related parties are present and the cases arise out of the same transaction or occurrence.)	Yes No
• -	e the following information:	
Court: <u>4</u>	6th District Cant 26000 Evergreen 20. South field MI.	
	NA	
	N/a	
Notes :	this not boon assigned one yet.	

	Two (2) completed Civil Enter the number of lawsuit in the blank be total in the blank. $\frac{8}{\text{# of Defendants}} + 2 = \frac{10}{\text{Total}}$ Received by Clerk:	defendow, ad	Sheets. dants named in your d 2 and then enter the Complaints. are complete:		Case:2:14-cv-12167 Judge: Cleland, Robert H. MJ: Hluchaniuk, Michael J. Filed: 06-02-2014 At 12:55 PM CMP DAVIS-BEY v. STATE OF MI, ET AL (dat)
5	If any of your defendar Provide two (2) extra control of the second of t	opies o he Filir n filing	f the complaint for the United in the Unit	.S. Atto	If Asking That The Filing Fee Be Waived: Two (2) completed Application to Proceed in District Court without Prepaying Fees or Costs forms.
S	Received by Clerk:	Receipt		/ill emp	Received by Clerk: Sloy to notify your defendants: Service via Waiver of Summons (U.S. Government cannot be a defendant)
5	Two (2) completed summonses for each defendant including each defendant's name and address.		Two (2) completed USM – 285 Forms per defendant, if you are requesting the U.S. Marshal conduct service of your complaint. Two (2) completed Request for Service by U.S. Marshal form.		You need not submit any forms regarding the Waive of Summons to the Clerk. Once your case has been filed, or the Application to Proceed without Prepaying Fees and Costs has been granted, you will need: One (1) Notice of a Lawsuit and Request to Waive Service of a Summons form per defendant. Two (2) Waiver of the Service of Summons form per defendant.
	Received by Clerk:	-	Received by Clerk:		Send these forms along with your filed complaint a a self-addressed stamped envelope to each of you defendants.